

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A. General:

1. Claims 1, 14, 22, 35, 43, and 60 - 66 have been amended as discussed below.
2. New claim 66 was previously added.
3. Claims 2 - 6, 9 - 13, 15 - 21, 23 - 27, 30 - 34, 36 - 42, 44 - 48, 51, and 53 - 59 have been previously canceled.
4. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 22, 28, 29, 35, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60 - 66 remain in the application.

B. §101 Rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 14, 35, 60, 61, 63, and 65 under 35 §USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended each of the rejected claims to recite: 1) that what is being provided is an interactive training method, and 2) that the random selection as recited in each claim causes the simulated person to behave unpredictably thereby providing realistic interactive training for the user. Support is found in the specification, page 10, lines 7 - 30. Because claims 14, 35, 60, 61, 63, and 65 now recite a useful, concrete and tangible result, i.e., realistic, interactive training based on the random selection, and, hence, unpredictability, of the simulated person's responses, the claims now recite statutory subject matter thereby obviating this rejection.

C. §112 Rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 22, 28, 29, 35, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60 - 66 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that:

1. The phrase "reasonable and consistent" found in all of the independent claims is a relative term that renders the claims indefinite. Based on the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has deleted "reasonable and" from all independent claims thereby, per the Examiner, rendering the claim definite and obviating this rejection.

2. Claims 14, 22, 35, 43, and 60 - 65 do not define how the tracking of changes in the emotional state of the simulated person affects the random selection of responses.

To obviate this rejection, Applicant has amended the rejected claims to recite that the logical component assigns a probability to each available response based on the simulated person's emotional state and then uses the probabilities to affect the random selection from the list of available responses which clarifies how the emotional component affects the selections thereby obviating this rejection.

3. Claim 66's recited phrase "said simulated person's emotional state" has insufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended claim 66 to now recite --an emotional state of said simulated person-- thereby providing the needed antecedent basis and obviating this rejection.

D. Conclusion:

In view of the above, Applicant submits that each of the presently pending claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. Allowance of claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 22, 28, 29, 35, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60 - 66 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
Applied Physics Laboratory



Francis A. Cooch
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,495

Date October 10, 2006

FAC:cls
(240) 228-5640